DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 185 036 SP 015 844

AUTHOR Blanchard, B. Everard
TITLE Educational Leadership in Teacher Education.
PUB DATE Oct 79
NOTE 19p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Responsibility; Administrator Role; *Deans; *Educational Administration; Educational Improvement; Higher Education; *Leadership Responsibility; *Preservice Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

A total of 12,194 faculty members at institutions awarding degrees in education participated in a survey investigating the role of the dean as an educational leader within the university. A rating scale of twenty-one leadership characteristics, developed specifically for this research, yielded statistical information about the attitudes of college and university faculty towards the role and responsibility of educational administrators. Results indicate that faculty members tend to feel that deans of education lack the willingness and the knowledge to provide effective professional leadership, especially with regard to the prompt and timely dissemination of educational research findings. (LH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED185036

EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP IN TEACHER EDUCATION

by

B. Everard Blanchard, Ph.D.

President

Villa Educational Research Associates

Villa Park, Illinois 60181

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
B. Everard Blanchard

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SCIENTIA PAEDAGOGICA EXPERIMENTALIS

XVI, I

GENT, HENRI-DUNANTLAAN, 1

October, 1979

SP 015 844

EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP IN TEACHER EDUCATION

Introduction

Whether American boys and girls enrolled in public schools acquire an adequate education or not depends directly upon the type of training their teachers were exposed to the collegiate level.

While colleges and universities engaged in teacher education may be influenced by Federal, State and local school guidelines as well as potential pressures from regional and professional accreditation associations, the basic responsibility for implementing educational leadership rests squarely in the hands of the Dean of education. The faculty of any institution will respond according to the type of educational exercised by the Dean.

College and university professors as well as professional personnel at the pre-school, early education and elementary levels of education are occasionally involved in research activity. Whether this type of research, as may be related to children, achieves significance or not depends upon the quality of training these individuals might have received in higher education. It is a well-known fact that some colleges and universities engaged in teacher education at the undergraduate and graduate levels place but scant emphasis, if any, on research methodology, or the basic tools of research, namely, statistics.

Whatever destination teacher education may decide upon in the preparation of future teachers and related personnel for public schools, methodologies of research and statistics should be required for both the baccalaureate and the master's degree in education. If the curricula at the pre-school, early childhood and elementary levels are to be revised, we will need researchers who are trained efficiently and who can discover new and better methods and techniques for teaching children. The mere personal pronouncements of educators and the ukases of their professional associations are in some cases built upon heresay and opinion, all of which provide no logical encouragement for improving research.

Educational administration is concerned not only with the plan of organization and the procedures being utilized. It is involved with the process by which these practices are adopted, support for them is maintained, and new practices are considered and initiated. An educational administrator is responsible for expediting a process which brings all the persons with legitimate interests in a program into effective collaboration in planning for it.

Since American children are required by the majority of States to attend the public schools between the ages of 7 - 16, each State should be required to prepare teachers so that they may provide the type of educational atmosphere which will provide every youth the opportunity to realize his or her maximum potential capabilities mentally, socially, emotionally, physically and spiritually. To do anything less would be depriving boys and girls from the basic essentials of living happily in a democratic society.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of the investigation was as follows:

To evaluate the educational leadership provided in accredited colleges and universities engaged in teacher education. The Dean of the School of Education/Department of Education is primarily responsible for all final outcomes as may be related to the organization, administration, and supervision in teacher education. It is the Dean's responsibility to initiate an educational administration concept which will challenge all professional personnel, students, alumni, and interested patrons of teacher education. To what extent this is actually being achieved, or not, is the subject of this inquiry.

Sampling Population

A preliminary letter was forwarded to the Chairmen of the Schools of Education/Departments of Education of 459 colleges and universities listed as having "Teacher Education" programs[1] inquiring as to whether they

---

[1] Accredited Institutions of Higher Education, 1971-72. Published by The Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education by the American Council On Education, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C., 20036, pp. 3 - 131.

might be interested in participating in an evaluation of the Dean of Education pertaining to his leadership responsibilities in teacher education.

Of the total number of teacher training institutions contacted, namely, 459, an estimated 325, or 71 per cent responded indicating that they would be interested in participating in the survey.

Approximately 12,194 faculty members participated in this study. Broken down, this number represented 6,056 assistant professors, 3,921 associate professors and 2,217 full professors. These men and women represented eleven departments of education, namely, Educational Foundations, Reading, Early Education, Elementary Education, Secondary Education, Guidance and Counseling, Administration and Supervision, Curriculum Development, Business Education, Music and Physical Education.

This study began in the Summer of 1972 and concluded in the Fall of 1975. The sampling population is considered representative. Table I provides a summary of the sampling population.

Procedures Utilized to Initiate the Study

Four letters were forwarded to the Chairmen of the Schools of Education/Departments of Education. The preliminary letter merely stated the purpose of the study and inquired as to whether the school might be interested in participating. The second letter contained the proposed sixty "educational leadership" chacateristics suggested by the writer. The faculty members were asked to review each of the proposed "leadership characteristics" very carefully. If they believed that some should be omitted, changed, or added, this was to be their prerogative. In any case, faculty members were further asked to return this data at their earliest convenience. The result of this procedure finalized a rating scale listing but twenty-one "leadership chacteristics, developed by and acceptable to the majority of participating faculty members. The third letter returned the finalized rating scale to each of the participating faculty who then rated the Dean of the School of Education/Department of Education. After having received this rating from the faculty, some three months later, a

Table I

Summary of Sampling Population

	Education Department	Total Number of Faculty Ratings	Per Cent[2]	Professorial Rank		
				Assistant	Associate	Full Prof.
1.	Educational Foundations ..	1,216	3.74	642	334	240
2.	Reading	1,162	3.58	573	454	135
3.	Early Education.	1,326	4.08	680	423	223
4.	Elementary Education	1,019	3.14	495	365	159
5.	Secondary Education	1,116	3.48	410	374	332
6.	Guidance and Counseling ...	1,053	3.24	478	336	239
7.	Administration and Supervision	967	2.98	409	318	240
8.	Curriculum Development ..	1,136	3.50	626	354	156
9.	Business Education	1,331	4.10	731	465	135
10.	Music	1,008	3.10	593	234	181
11.	Physical Education	860	2.65	419	264	177
	Totals	12,194	3.41[3] (Mean)	6,056	3,921	2,217
	Per cent			50	32	18

[2]Per cent of faculty ratings for each of 325 participating schools.

[3]Approximately 37.52 faculty ratings per college/university.

fourth letter containing a second unmarked rating scale was submitted to the same faculty members to re-evaluate the Dean of Education. The express purpose of this second follow-up evaluation was to discern if any discrepancies existed between the first and the second rating. Additionally, the possibility existed that some faculty members might have changed their minds about the Dean since the first assessment took place.

The finalized "educational leadership" rating scale used to judge the performance of the Dean of Education is illustrated in Table II.

Validity and Reliability Studies

The rating scale is assumed to possess content validity. The investigator examined many professional texts, monographs, courses of study in administration, objectives proposed by state departments of education and regional accreditation associations. From these sources, some sixty "educational leadership criteria were developed directly related to the responsibilities of the Dean of Education. These sixty criteria constituted the original rating scale devised by the writer.

This rating scale was then submitted to 12,194 professors of education (qualified experts) located in 325 colleges/universities. The professors examined these sixty "leadership characteristics" very carefully. As a result, a twenty-one "educational leadership" appraisal instrument resulted. This rating scale developed and acceptable to the majority of faculty members constituted the instrument which was used in this investigation.

The term validity is generally defined as the extent to which the test, or rating scale in this case, "measures" what it is supposed to measure. In this study, "educational leadership" characteristics are associated with the functions of the Dean of Education. This performance of the Dean was judged by faculty members. How well the Deans of Education displayed evidence of the criteria listed as "leadership characteristics" is revealed in Table III. As may be noted by the reader, the validity coefficients extended from .52 to .77 with a mean validity for the entire scale at .67. Inter-correlations between the twenty-one criteria using the Pearson r provided the validity coefficients.

Table II

Educational Leadership Rating Scale: Dean of Education

NAME OF RATER (OPTIONAL) _____ DATE _____

NAME OF COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY _____

ADDRESS _____

CITY _____ STATE _____ ZIP CODE _____

PROFESSIONAL RANK OF RATER _____
(Assistant professor, Associate, etc.)

DEPARTMENTAL AREA OF SPECIALIZATION TEACHING _____
(Early El., Secondary, etc.)

UPON COMPLETION OF RATING, YOUR COMMENTS ARE CORDIALLY INVITED.

WHAT YOU ARE TO DO:

This questionnaire is designed to evaluate the functions as performed by the Dean of Education in both the undergraduate and graduate programs in teacher education in your institution. Your judgment in assessing the educational leadership of the Dean will REMAIN CONFIDENTIAL.

A continuum scale with descriptions from 1 through 5, follows:

1	2	3	4	5
NEVER	SELDOM	SOMETIMES	OFTEN	ALWAYS

To the right of each descriptive statement are five numbers. ENCIRCLE the NUMBER you believe best describes the Dean of Education in your institution. Consider your procedures and habits at the present time in arriving at your decision.

FOR EXAMPLE:

OBJECTIVES	NEVER	SELDOM	SOMETIMES	OFTEN	ALWAYS
Evidence of:					
1. understanding the democratic process	1	2	3	4	5
2. encouraging faculty research	1	2	3	4	5
3. ability to work cooperatively with the faculty	1	2	3	4	5

Table II (Con't.)

Educational Leadership Rating Scale: Dean of Education

WHO WILL DO THE RATING?

Two or more faculty members from each of the eleven departments of education in the School of Education/Department of Education are encouraged to participate in the evaluation. The departments invited to participate include: Educational Fourndations, Reading, Early Education, Elementary Education, Secondary Education, Guidance and Counseling, Administration and Supervision, Curriculum Development, Business Education, Music and Physical Education.

Each faulty member will rate the Dean of Education individually. Your Chairman of the Department of Education/School of Education has an ample supply of rating scales. When COMPLETED, we shall deeply appreciate your returning the rating scale at your convenience. Please review all data to see that you have completed all the questions BEFORE returning to the writer.

NOW THAT THE GROUND RULES HAVE BEEN ESTABLISHED, WE CAN PROCEED WITH THE EVALUATION.

ACADEMIC AND ADMINISTRATIVE EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP CHARACTERISTICS	NEVER	SELDOM	SOMETIMES	OFTEN	ALWAYS
Evidence of:					
1. a responsibility to lead the School of Education in accomplishing its own specific purposes and goals	1	2	3	4	5
2. an understanding and sensitivity to the democratic process	1	2	3	4	5
3. a comprehension of the various elements of the School of Education's students, faculty, supporting staff and general public	1	2	3	4	5
4. a knowledge and appreciation of the need for improving teaching effectiveness	1	2	3	4	5
5. the unique ability to inspire faculty members to greater effort in their professional pursuits	1	2	3	4	5
6. being able to establish a strong faculty and personnel relations program	1	2	3	4	5
7. a commitment to the philosophy, that ideas and suggestions should flow up, as well as down, in the administrative hierarchy	1	2	3	4	5

Table II (Con't.)

Educational Leadership Rating Scale: Dean of Education

ACADEMIC AND ADMINISTRATIVE EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP CHARACTERISTICS	NEVER	SELDOM	SOMETIMES	OFTEN	ALWAYS
Evidence of:					
8. a commitment to Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Employment	1	2	3	4	5
9. a constant critical review of the instructional programs	1	2	3	4	5
10. the ability to direct short-range and long-range planning related to institutional goals	1	2	3	4	5
11. the ability to develop and maintain an educational climate in which students and faculty have the opportunity to achieve their greatest potential and are encouraged and motivated to do so	1	2	3	4	5
12. the ability to stimulate, develop and maintain an administrative structure in which students can realize that their views are considered in the governance of the School of Education/Department of Education	1	2	3	4	5
13. a commitment to the maintenance of a structural framework which insures the preservation of academic freedom	1	2	3	4	5
14. identifying and clearly defining the roles of members of the administration, faculty, supporting personnel and programs	1	2	3	4	5
15. administering the business affairs of the School of Education/Department of Education through sound management. This responsibility includes developing and maintaining an appropiate administrative organization and a policy-making structure for the efficient, effective and accountable utilization of all financial resources	1	2	3	4	5
16. enthusiasm and support for faculty members research interests and activities	1	2	3	4	5

Table II (Con't.)

Educational Leadership Rating Scale: Dean of Education

ACADEMIC AND ADMINISTRATIVE EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP CHARACTERISTICS

Evidence of:	NEVER	SELDOM	SOMETIMES	OFTEN	ALWAYS
17. knowing the field of educational administration well enough to indicate that he (Dean) understands the relationship between what is <u>said</u> and what is <u>done</u>	1	2	3	4	5
18. a willingness to make difficult decisions and accept responsibility for such decisions	1	2	3	4	5
19. the ability to delegate authority and commensurate responsibilities to others	1	2	3	4	5
20. stressing the importance of having periodic meetings between the faculties of the College of Liberal Arts and the School of Education/Department of Education since both schools share the prospective education candidate an equal number of years in training	1	2	3	4	5
21. understanding that departmental meetings as well as combined departmental meetings should generate an enthusiasm and appreciation of collective thinking on critical issue in education	1	2	3	4	5

NOW THAT YOU HAVE COMPLETED THE RATING OF THE DEAN, DO YOU HAVE ANY COMMENTS THAT YOU WOULD LIKE TO MAKE? SPACE IS PROVIDED BELOW:

Table III
Validity and Reliability Findings

Criterion Number**	Validity	Reliability	Standard Deviation
1	.73	.94	1.05
2	.69	.93	1.72
3	.61	.90	1.83
4	.71	.91	2.06
5	.75	.84	2.12
6	.64	.88	1.94
7	.63	.92	1.77
8	.60	.87	2.19
9	.54	.89	1.83
10	.72	.86	2.35
11	.59	.88	2.22
12	.76	.89	2.27
13	.68	.92	1.96
14	.77	.85	2.05
15	.65	.91	1.91
16	.68	.94	2.62
17	.72	.85	2.40
18	.52	.92	2.57
19	.70	.83	2.28
20	.64	.91	1.95
21	.57	.93	1.82
Mean validity ...	.67		
Mean reliability		.90	

**Criterion Number refers to each of the "Leadership characteristics" which appear in the rating scale (Table II, pages 7 - 9).

The test-retest method was utilized to determine the reliability coefficient of the rating scale, since the rating scale was administered twice at different times to the same individuals. Using the two sets of scores, a Pearson product-moment correlation was computed and the results ranged from .83 to .94 with a mean reliability coefficient of .90. The standard deviations of the reliability coefficients extended from 1.05 to 2.62.

Discussion

Table IV illustrates the final mean ratings of the Dean of education for the twenty-one "educational leadership" criteria used in this investigation. It may be noted in Item 1, "a responsibility to lead the School of Education in accomplishing its own specific purposes and goals," that the mean ratings for each of the eleven departments of education ranged from 2.50 to 3.35 with a mean rating for combined departments of education being 2.93. It is highly doubtful whether professional leadership can continue to exist by rendering educational services on a "Seldom" or "Sometimes" basis in attempting to reach specific purposes and goals.

It is interesting to note Item 7, "a commitment to the philosophy, that ideas and suggestions should flow up, as well as down, in the administrative hierarchy," that the ratings extended from 2.19 to 2.73, with a combined departmental mean rating of 2.49. This tells us that Deans of education are susceptible to such a philosophy on either a "Seldom" or "Sometimes" basis.

Item 16 which refers to the "enthusiasm and support for faculty members research interests and activities" as rendred by the typical Dean of education resulted in mean ratings extending from 2.00 to 2.75, with a combined department mean of 2.37.

One of the most appalling problems confronting modern public education stems from the fact that too few teachers and administrators are ardent producers and consumers of research. Education is man's most important business. Research has been the golden key by which the door to improvements has been opened.

Item 20, "stressing the importance of having periodic meetings between the faculties of the College of Liberal Arts and the School of Education/Department of Education since both share the prospective education candidate an equal number of years" has earned the lowest departmental rating with a mean of 1.92. Departmental ratings displayed means ranging from 1.61 to 2.35.

The typical Dean of education "Seldom" exhibits any interest in the College of Liberal Arts. Whether or not anyone has hit upon an ideal program for teacher training may be a matter for debate, but anyone who is concerned by present poor methods should be grateful that some individuals are systematically attacking the problem.

If candidates for teaching, administrative positions and related support-personnel in public schools are to continue to be required to spend the first two years in the College of Liberal Arts engaging in what is called, general education and then the final two years in a School of Education taking the professional and specialized courses of study, both of these schools should join hands cooperatively seeking to improve public education as it may be related to the general welfare of our society.

It is interesting to note, that of the twenty-one "educational leadership" characteristics, no combined departmental mean rating exceeded 3.25. This latter figure is in the "Sometimes" category. It appears that teacher education today according to the Dean's working relationships with all interested personnel, is actally turning the educational clock back a good half century!

Comments by Faculty Members

Approximately 20 per cent, or 2,438 faculty members volunteered some rather cogent explanations as to why the Dean of education was failing to perform an expected action in educational leadership. The justifications offered by the faculty are hereby listed in their rank order of importance according to the frequency of mention. Only those reasons cited by the faculty exceeding 100 frequencies of mention have been listed. See Table V.

Table IV

Summary of Dean's Evaluation by Faculty Members

Criterion Number[1]	Departments of Education											
	EF.[2]	RDG.[2]	EE.[2]	EL.[2]	SEC.[2]	GC.[2]	AS.[2]	CD.[2]	BE.[2]	M.[2]	PE.[2]	Weighted Mean Rating
1	2.81	3.10	3.35	2.76	2.90	2.81	2.50	3.00	2.95	2.88	3.15	2.93
2	3.15	3.05	3.03	3.42	3.10	3.15	3.00	2.98	3.62	3.24	3.08	3.17
3	3.18	2.95	2.86	2.94	2.98	3.06	3.17	2.94	3.27	3.09	2.96	3.14
4	3.35	2.80	2.61	3.41	3.17	3.04	3.33	3.45	2.98	2.76	3.11	3.09
5	2.46	3.00	2.87	2.86	2.60	2.54	2.93	3.00	2.86	2.62	2.57	2.76
6	2.85	2.97	3.14	2.85	2.95	3.12	3.20	3.18	2.83	2.91	3.17	3.02
7	2.27	2.50	2.73	2.50	2.32	2,19	2.58	2.43	2,70	2.55	2.67	2.49
8	3.00	2.75	3.19	3.08	3.43	3.37	3.25	3.64	3.50	3.18	3.41	3.25
9	2.91	2.81	2.64	3.10	3.00	2.93	2.84	3.20	2.95	2.85	3.26	2.95
10	2.64	3.22	3.36	3.00	3.15	3.08	2.97	3.36	3.40	3.19	3.05	3.13
11	3.08	2.86	2.94	2.86	3.09	2.84	3.10	3.00	2.90	3.06	3.22	3.00
12	2.34	2.91	3.16	2.80	2.95	2.47	2.56	2.74	3.04	2.81	2.90	2.79
13	3.32	3.15	3.04	3.00	2.87	2.94	2.67	2.80	3.05	2.90	2.71	2.95
14	2.90	3.00	2.86	2.91	2.70	2.84	2.88	3.04	2.97	2.77	2.99	2.90
15	3.51	3.30	2.98	3.00	3.17	3.25	3.30	3.15	3.10	3.20	3.06	3.18
16	2.07	2.00	2.35	2.40	2.15	2.36	2.40	2.61	2.43	2.59	2.75	2.37
17	2.83	2.76	2.91	2.80	2.63	2.77	2.84	2.95	2.40	2.56	2.66	2.74
18	3.19	3.22	3.14	3.01	2.96	2.80	3.16	2.84	3.30	2.67	2.88	3.02
19	3.00	2.98	2.76	3.09	2.91	2.86	3.12	2.87	3.16	2.98	3.20	2.99
20	1.93	2.05	2.35	1.74	1.83	2.10	1.91	2.20	1.61	1.56	1.80	1.92
21	2.74	2.65	2.80	2.93	3.00	2.88	3.10	3.05	3.26	2.74	2.86	2.91
Weighted Mean ...	2.83	2.86	2.91	2.88	2.85	2.83	2.90	2.97	2.97	2.81	2.93	

[1]The criterion number refer to the twenty-one "leadership characteristics listed in the rating scale. See Table II.

[2]EF refers to Educational Foundations; RDG refers to Reading; EE refers to Early Education; EL refers to Elementary Education; SEC refers to Secondary Education; GC refers to Guidance and Counseling; AS refers to Administration and Supervision; CD refers to Curriculum Development; BE refers to Business Education; M refers to Music and PE refers to Physical Education.

Table V

Comments by Faculty Members

No.	C O M M E N T S N = 2.438	Frequency of Mention
1.	Failure to work cooperatively with the faculty in determining the specific purposes and goals of the School of Education/Department of Education	351
2.	Inability or unwillingness to democratize procedures. Delegation of authority and responsibility lacking. A School of Education/Department of Education must be organized to make full use of its available talent	330
3.	Inability to keep pace with social change. This implies that educational leadership should emanate from the Dean's office and that he must be an educator as well as a business agent	327
4.	Failure to develop effective undergraduate, or graduate programs in teacher education. Operating the School of Education/Department of Education is something more than purchasing audio-visual aids, or encyclopedias for the library. School administration should involve leadership! It requires a Dean who can secure ideas from all the faculty, and perhaps students, relative to a new program and then is able to interpret these ideas to the Board of Trustees and administration in a concise and clear manner so that they can be realized	284
5.	Failure to recognize the attainments of faculty members ...	185
6.	Lack of sense of timing. Some Deans do not possess the faculty of taking the proper action at the right time. This means the Dean should have the capacity to sense the need for courageous action at the right time and for just causes	175
7.	Inability to make decisions intelligently	162
8.	Occasionally, a newly appointed Dean will come to the School of Education loaded with ideas and without taking the time to become acquainted with his milieu will start a small-scale revolution in educational philosophy, procedures and method	140

Table V (Con't.)

Comments by Faculty Members

No.	C O M M E N T S N = 2,438	Frequency of Mention
9.	Inability to be a good listener. This is the Dean who follows the dictim, "Nothing is quite so annoying as to have someone go right on talking when you're interrupting"	133
10.	Inability to present a point of view clearly and forcefully. Every prospective Dean of education should be taught in their graduate work how to organize material logically, present data effectively and to be able to defend a point of view	130
11.	Critical judgement about a predecessor. Spending time criticizing the predecessor is neither ethical nor in the best interests of the School of education	118
12.	Inability to suppress cynical remarks about personalities or events and avoiding the use of vulgarisms and the use of unusual or inappropiate vocabulary ...	103

Conclusions

Whatever causes may be assigned to the apparent negligence of the Dean of education to provide adequate administrative educational leadership may well be the subject of a future investigator.

No matter how rigid or how loose the certification rules and regulations of a state may be, the initial responsibility for the preparation of school personnel is vested in the training institution. If there are incompetent individuals on the professional staff of the educational system, it is because certain institutions accepted them for training and subsequently sponsored them for admission to the profession.

An important fact to be recognized, sometimes to the discomforture of the educational administrator (Dean) is that educational policy is not a concern of the educator only. It is an appropiate and legitimate concern

of people in all walks of life. This is true not only because of their interest in the education of their own children but also because of their marked interest for general social welfare and policy with which educational policy is so closely and significantly related.

Teacher training institutions are expected not only to preserve and disseminate the existing store of knowledge but to add to that store. In the educational system the extension of knowledge by the process of research has come to be recognized as a major function of universities. As far as this study is concerned, the faculty members tend to feel that the Dean of education lacks the knowledge or awareness of research techniques.

If this nation continues in the same direction for the next decade or more, teacher education will become impotent!